



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,908	06/22/2001	Dominik J. Schmidt		7455

38236 7590 09/26/2003

DOMINIK J. SCHMIDT  
P.O. BOX 20541  
STANDFORD, CA 94309

EXAMINER
----------

LA, ANH V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2636

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

h

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,908

Applicant(s)

SCHMIDT, DOMINIK J.

Examiner

Anh V La

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The specification is objected to because on page 1, line 4, and page 12, line 20, blank lines need to be filed.

2. The claims is objected to because there are many typographical errors. In claim 14, line 1, the phrase "claim 12" should be changed to - -claim 13--. In claims 15-18, and 20, line 1, the phrase "claim 11" should be changed to - -claim 13--.

3. Claims 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the protocol" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the short-range wireless transceiver core" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the short-range wireless transceiver core" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the memory array core" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the memory array core" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2636

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the memory array core" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brady.

Regarding claim 1, Brady discloses a method for parallel testing of memory (column 1, lines 35-60) on a plurality of wireless devices comprising issuing a command to each wireless device to test its memory, retrieving the results of the command to test memory, and identifying one or more wireless devices with failed memory (figures 1-3b, column 3, lines 5-50).

Regarding claim 2, Brady discloses wireless RF protocol (col. 3, lines 30-50).

Regarding claim 3, Brady discloses one or more pads on the devices as antennas (col. 4, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 6, Brady discloses performing wafer sort tests on the wireless devices (col. 6, lines 15-37).

Regarding claim 7, Brady discloses performing parametrics tests on the wireless devices (col. 6, lines 15-37).

Art Unit: 2636

Regarding claim 8, Brady discloses collecting memory test results from the wireless devices and displaying test results on a computer (228, 322).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady in view of Corman.

Regarding claims 4-5, Brady discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose the use of power traces on the devices as antennas. Corman discloses the use of power traces on devices as antennas (col. 8, lines 39-45). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the use of power traces on the devices as antennas to the method of Brady as taught by Corman for the purpose of effective wireless communication.

8. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady in view of Hsia.

Regarding claims 9-10, Brady discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose the step of erasing test software from the memory of each wireless device and reclaiming memory for the test

Art Unit: 2636

software of operating software on each wireless device. Hsia teaches the use of the step of erasing test software from the memory of each wireless device and reclaiming memory for the test software of operating software on each wireless device (figure 2). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the step of erasing test software from the memory of each wireless device and reclaiming memory for the test software of operating software on each wireless device to the method of Brady as taught by Hsia for the purpose of reclaiming the memory after performing tests.

9. Claims 11-12, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady in view of Friedman and Brehm.

Regarding claim 11, Brady discloses one or more wireless device, each device including memory (col. 1, lines 35-60), a tester 322, 228 including a transceiver, a computer 322, 228 couple to the transceiver (col. 4, lines 60-65) to test all wireless devices in parallel by issuing a single test command using a wireless signal (fig. 1-3b, col. 3, lines 30-50). Brady does not disclose a processor coupled to the memory and the computer to store test patterns and test results. Friedman discloses a processor coupled to memory (col. 12, lines 55-60). Brehm discloses a computer to store test patterns and test results (abstract). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a processor coupled to the memory and the computer to store test patterns and test results to the system of

Brady as taught by Friedman and Brehm for the purpose of effectively processing and storing the tests.

Regarding claim 12, Brady discloses a multi-mode wireless circuit on a single substrate (fig. 2A-3B).

Regarding claim 19, Brady discloses the wireless devices being formed on a wafer, a power line deposited on the wafer during processing and adapted to be removed after wafer dicing and a plurality of switches coupled to the devices and the power line to allow each wireless device on the wafer to be tested in a sequence (col. 6, lines 15-37, col. 8, lines 15-65, fig. 2A-5B).

10. Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claims 14-18 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh V La whose telephone number is (703) 305-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

Art Unit: 2636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached on (703) 305-4717. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anh V La', with a stylized, flowing script.

Anh V La  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2636

AI  
September 15, 2003